

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed May 14, 2009. Claims 1-27 were pending in the present application. This Amendment amends claims 1, 3, 4, 7, and 9-23, cancels claims 25-27 without prejudice, and adds new claim 28, leaving pending in the application claims 1-24 and 28. Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced by virtue of these amendments. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Abstract

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because “the form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as ‘comprising’ should be avoided.” (Office Action: pg. 2). The abstract has been amended accordingly.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection of Claims 1-5, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18, 20, and 23

Claims 1-5, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18, 20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by McAfee et al. (U.S. Publication 2003/0206312 A1, hereinafter “McAfee”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants’ independent claim 1 is directed to a method for preventing the output of information from a computer system to an electronic device (e.g., a printer) if the geographic location of the computer system is remote from the geographic location of the electronic device. The technique can be used, for example, to avoid the accidental printing of sensitive information at a remote printer where the printed information cannot be immediately retrieved by the initiator of the print request.

In one set of embodiments, the method includes receiving, by a computer system, a request to output information to an electronic device. The method further includes determining, by the computer system, a geographic location of the computer system and a geographic location of the electronic device. For example, the geographic locations can be determined using global positioning satellite (GPS) data or network topography data. Once the geographic locations are determined, the computer system can prevent the output of the

information to the electronic device if the computer system and electronic device are remote from each other.

In accordance with the above, claim 1 (as amended) recites:

A method for outputting information comprising:
accessing, by a computer system, information associated with an application running on said computer system;
receiving, by said computer system, a request to output said information to an electronic device;
determining, by said computer system, a geographic location of said computer system;
determining, by said computer system, a geographic location of said electronic device;
determining, by said computer system, if said geographic location of said computer system is remote to said geographic location of said electronic device; and
if said geographic location of said computer system is remote to said geographic location of said electronic device, preventing, by said computer system, output of said information to said electronic device.

McAfee is directed to a “printer driver [that] integrates local and remote printing.” “[A] user can initiate a print job from any authoring application (e.g., word processor) and have that print job sent either to the local or remote printer via a common user interface provided by the printer driver.” (McAfee: Abstract).

Applicants submit that the invention of McAfee is substantially different from Applicants’ claim 1. As an initial matter, McAfee fails to disclose “determining, by said computer system, a geographic location of said computer system” as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added). No disclosure pertaining to this feature could be found in McAfee.

Further, McAfee fails to disclose “determining, by said computer system, a geographic location of said electronic device” as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added). The Office Action asserts that this feature of claim 1 is shown in McAfee at paragraph 54. (Office Action: pg. 3). However, the cited section of McAfee merely indicates that a printer driver may receive a “location identifier” (e.g., an IP or URL address) of a remote printer. Applicants submit that receiving an IP or URL address of a printer is significantly different from

determining a geographic location of the printer, because an IP/URL address of a device does not necessarily identify a geographic location of the device. Rather the IP/URL address merely indicates a network address at which the device can be accessed over a computer network (regardless of the actual geographic location of the device). Accordingly, McAfee fails to disclose “determining, by said computer system, a geographic location of said electronic device” as recited in claim 1.

Further, McAfee fails to disclose “if said geographic location of said computer system is remote to said geographic location of said electronic device, preventing, by said computer system, output of said information to said electronic device” as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added). McAfee does teach the concept of “print rules” that “can be created so as to favor local printing over remote printing whenever reasonably possible, or vice versa if desired.” (McAfee: para. 44). However, the print rules of McAfee are merely generic rule sets that determine whether print jobs are sent to a local or remote printer. McAfee does not provide an example of print rule, and does not provide an example of a condition that would cause a particular print job to be sent to one printer versus another.

In contrast, claim 1 recites a specific condition in which information is prevented from being outputted to an electronic device if the geographic location of the computer system is remote from the geographic location of the electronic device. McAfee does not teach such a condition/rule. Accordingly, McAfee fails to disclose “if said geographic location of said computer system is remote to said geographic location of said electronic device, preventing, by said computer system, output of said information to said electronic device” as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by McAfee, and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 10 and 18 recite features that are substantially similar to independent claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 1, and others.

Dependent claims 2-5, 11, 13, 17, 20, and 23 depend (either directly or indirectly) from independent claims 1, 10, and 18 respectively, and are thus allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claims 1, 10, and 18, and others.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 6, 7, 9, 12, 14-16, 19, 21, and 22

Claims 6, 7, 9, 12, 14-16, 19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McAfee. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 6, 7, 9, 12, 14-16, 19, 21, and 22 depend (either directly or indirectly) from independent claims 1, 10, and 18 respectively, which are not anticipated or rendered obvious by McAfee as discussed above. Accordingly, claims 6, 7, 9, 12, 14-16, 19, 21, and 22 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claims 1, 10, and 18, and others.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 8 and 24

Claims 8 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McAfee in view of Motegi (U.S. Patent 6,307,640, hereinafter “Motegi”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 8 and 24 depend from independent claims 1 and 18 respectively, which are not anticipated or rendered obvious by McAfee as discussed above. As best understood, the cited sections of Motegi do not cure the deficiencies of McAfee in this regard. Accordingly, claims 8 and 24 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claims 1 and 18, and others.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection of Claims 25-27

Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Motegi.

Claims 25-27 have been canceled without prejudice. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims is moot.

New Claim 28

New independent claim 28 has been added to cover various embodiments of the present invention. No new matter is added.

Claim 28 recites features that are substantially similar to independent claim 1. Accordingly, claim 28 is allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 1, and others.

Amendment to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the Specification as filed and do not add new matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Andrew J. Lee/

Andrew J. Lee
Reg. No. 60,371

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
A2L:m6s:m4g
62092345 v1